



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/501,168	02/09/2000	Stephen William Davies	2-6	3484

22046 7590 08/09/2007
DOCKET ADMINISTRATOR
LUCENT TECHNOLOGIES INC.
ROOM 2F-192
600-700 MOUNTAIN AVENUE
MURRAY HILL, NJ 07974-0636

EXAMINER

CUMMING, WILLIAM D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2617

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

08/09/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/501,168

Applicant(s)

DAVIES & VANDERVEEN

Examiner

WILLIAM D. CUMMING

Art Unit

2617

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 May 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8, 10-17 and 19-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8, 17 and 19-22 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 10-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 16 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
2. Claims 10, 11, 14, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being clearly anticipated by **Ala-Laurila, et al** as stated in paragraph 3 of the Office action dated December 13, 2006.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
4. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:
 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

5. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Ala-Laurila** in view of **LaPorta, et al** as stated in paragraph 5 of the Office action dated December 13, 2006.

7. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Ala-Laurila** in view of **Haartsen** as stated in paragraph 6 of the Office action dated December 13, 2006.

Allowable Subject Matter

8. Claims 1-2, 4-8, 17, and 19-22 are allowed.

9. Claim 16 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

10. As allowable subject matter has been indicated, applicant's reply must either comply with all formal requirements or specifically traverse each requirement not complied with. See 37 CFR 1.111(b) and MPEP § 707.07(a).

Response to Arguments

11. Applicant's arguments filed May 17, 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Anticipatory reference need not duplicate, word for word, what is in claims; anticipation can occur when claimed limitation is "*inherent*" or otherwise implicit in relevant reference (Standard Havens Products Incorporated v. Gencor Industries Incorporated, 21 USPQ2d 1321). During examination before the Patent and Trademark Office, claims must be given their **broadest reasonable interpretation and limitations from the specification may not be imputed to the claims** (Ex parte Akamatsu, 22 USPQ2d, 1918; In re Zletz, 13 USPQ2d 1320, In re Priest, 199 USPQ 11). In response to Applicant's argument, the law of anticipation requires that a distinction be made between the invention described or taught and the invention claimed. **It does not require that the reference "teach" what the subject patent teaches.** Assuming that a reference

is properly "prior art," it is only necessary that the claims under consideration
"read on" something disclosed in the reference, i.e., all limitations of the claim
are found in the reference, or "fully met" by it. It was held in In re Donohue, 226
USPQ 619, that, *"It is well settled that prior art under 35 USC §102(b) must*
sufficiently describe the claimed invention to have placed the public in
possession of it...Such possession is effected if one of ordinary skill in the art
could have combine the description of the invention with his own knowledge to
make the claimed invention." Clear inference to the artisan must be considered,
In re Preda, 159 USPQ 342. A prior art reference must be considered together
with the knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the pertinent art, In re Samour, 197
USPQ 1. During patent examination, the pending claims must be *"given the*
broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification." Claim term
is not limited to single embodiment disclosed in specification, since number of
embodiments disclosed does not determine meaning of the claim term, and
applicant cannot overcome *"heavy presumption"* that term takes on its ordinary
meaning simply by pointing to preferred embodiment (Teleflex Inc. v. Ficosa
North America Corp., CA FC, 6/21/02, 63 USPQ2d 1374). Applicants always
had the opportunity to amend the claims during prosecution and broad
interpretation by the examiner reduces the possibility that the claim, once issued,
will be interpreted more broadly than is justified. In re Prater, 415 F.2d 1393,
1404-05, 162 USPQ 541, 550-51 (CCPA1969). *"Arguments that the alleged*
anticipatory prior art is nonanalogous art' or teaches away from the invention' or

is not recognized as solving the problem solved by the claimed invention, [are] not germane' to a rejection under section 102." Twin Disc, Inc. v. United States, 231 USPQ 417, 424 (Cl. Ct. 1986) (quoting In re Self, 671 F.2d 1344, 213 USPQ 1, 7 (CCPA 1982)). A reference is no less anticipatory if, after disclosing the invention, the reference then disparages it. The question whether a reference "teaches away" from the invention is inapplicable to an anticipation analysis. • Celeritas Technologies Ltd. v. Rockwell International Corp., 150 F.3d 1354, 1361, 47 USPQ2d 1516, 1522-23 (Fed. Cir.1998).

Applicants' attorney seeing things in **Ala Laurila, et al** which no one else sees and then making up his own desire conclusions which **Ala Laurila, et al** does not support. Building a strawman and then to knock it down. Even taking the applicants' attorney imaginary disclosure, even if **Ala-Laurilla, et al's** base stations known from the start of time and the universe which base station to handoff, because how applicants claimed their invention, does meet the claimed limitations. It is clear to one even below ordinary skill in the art that **Ala-Laurilla, et al's** mobile station does receive a response to the request, when the second base station knows the first base station prior receiving the request and the response does indicate that the second base station can engage in expedited handoffs, **Ala-Laurilla, et al's** high security handoffs, with the first base station.

Applicants' attorney has NOT overcome the rejections and the application once again fails to be in condition for allowance.

Conclusion

12. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicants are reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

13. **A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.**

14. If applicants wish to request for an interview, an *"Applicant Initiated Interview Request"* form (PTOL-413A) should be submitted to the examiner prior to the interview in order to permit the examiner to prepare in advance for the interview and to focus on the issues to be discussed. This form should identify the participants of the interview, the proposed date of the interview, whether the interview will be personal, telephonic, or video conference, and should include a brief description of the issues to be discussed. A copy of the completed *"Applicant Initiated Interview Request"* form should be attached to the Interview Summary form, PTOL-413 at the completion of the interview and a copy should be given to applicant or applicant's representative.

15. If applicants request an interview after this **final rejection**, prior to the interview, the intended purpose and content of the interview should be presented briefly, in writing.

Such an interview may be granted if the examiner is convinced that disposal or clarification for appeal may be accomplished with only nominal further consideration.

Interviews merely to **restate arguments** of record or to **discuss new limitations** which would require more than nominal reconsideration or new search will be denied.

16. Electronic Notification of Outgoing Correspondence (e-Office Action)

Effective December 16, 2006, the United States Patent and Trademark Office (Office) will begin a pilot program to provide a limited number of Private PAIR users with the option of receiving electronic notification of some outgoing correspondence related to their US patents and US national patent applications retrievable through Private PAIR instead of a paper mailing of the correspondence. Patent Cooperation Treaty (PCT) applications will not be included in this pilot.

Participants in this pilot program will no longer receive paper mailings for most correspondence originating from a Technology Center. However, since several areas of the Office have independent mailing processes, pilot participants will continue to receive paper mailings for correspondence originating from several areas of the Office including, but not limited to: Office of Initial Patent Examination, Petitions, PCT, Appeals, Publications, Interference, and Reexamination.

A Private PAIR user will be able to opt-in to receive electronic mail message (email) notifications of outgoing correspondence by selecting the appropriate choice on the Customer Number Details screen for a customer number associated with a correspondence address after logging in to Private PAIR and providing between one and three email addresses to be used for these notifications. The Private Pair user must be a registered patent attorney or agent of record, or a pro se inventor who is a named

inventor in the application associated with the customer number through which Private PAIR is accessed, The Office will then send a notification to each provided email address if a new outgoing correspondence has been prepared for the patents or patent applications associated with the user's Customer Number. Each email notification will list all applications, associated with the corresponding Customer Number, in which new outgoing correspondence was prepared for the corresponding electronic application files within the preceding 24 hours. Each email notification will be entered into the corresponding application files. The new outgoing correspondence will become available for viewing and downloading through Private PAIR within two business days of the date of the email notification.

Applicants will have the ability to opt-in or opt-out of receiving electronic notification of Office actions at any time. However, the status of each individual outgoing correspondence, whether electronic or paper, will be determined at the time of the printing of the form PTOL-90 cover sheet (at the time the outgoing correspondence becomes available for viewing, i.e., the date indicated on the correspondence).

The email notification described above will be sent after the Office action has been prepared and entered into the record. The period for reply to any Office correspondence to which a reply is required will commence on the date indicated on the outgoing Office such outgoing correspondence for all other purposes (e.g., 37 CFR 1.71(g)(2), 1.97(b), 1.701 through 1.705). The Office communication will become available for downloading and viewing through Private PAIR on the date indicated on the correspondence.

If none of the documents in each of the applications listed in the email notifications are viewed or downloaded through Private PAIR within seven calendar days after the emails are sent, a courtesy postcard notifying the applicant of the availability of electronic Office action will be mailed to the correspondence address associated with the applicant's corresponding Customer Number for each of those applications. The mailing of a courtesy postcard will not restart the time period for reply, and the period for reply to any outgoing Office correspondence to which a reply is required will continue to be measured from the date indicated on such outgoing Office correspondence.

Please note that the email notification procedure outlined above is simply an automated email sent by the Office to alert applicant that an official Office correspondence has been entered in the official record that will be available for viewing via private PAIR. It is not an email sent by the examiner and does not alter the Office policy prohibiting an applicant or examiner from engaging in improper email correspondence. See MPEP section 502.03.

The e-Office Action Pilot Program will begin with a limited number of participants. The Pilot Program will last approximately six months. Upon the conclusion of the pilot program the success of the pilot will be evaluated. At that time decisions will be made as to whether or not to make modifications to the e-Office action program and whether or not to permanently implement the program.

Thus, if the pilot program is successful and a decision is made to permanently implement the program, it is expected that the e-Office Action Program will go into full

production sometime around June 2007 at which point the program will be open to all users (registered patent attorney or agent of record, or a pro se inventor who is a named inventor in the application associated with the customer number through which Private PAIR is accessed) having a Customer Number and access to Private PAIR.

For further information please contact the Patent Electronic Business Center (EBC) 866-217-9197 (toll-free) or 571-272-4100 Monday through Friday from 6 a.m. to 12 Midnight Eastern Time or send e-mail to ebc@uspto.gov

Date 12/19/2006

17. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **WILLIAM D. CUMMING** whose telephone number is **571-272-7861**. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 11:30am-4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Charles Appiah can be reached on 571-272-7904. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

18. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/WILLIAM D. CUMMING/
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2617



UNITED STATES
PATENT AND
TRADEMARK OFFICE

William Cumming
Primary Patent Examiner
William.Cumming@uspto.gov